## REMARKS

I. Introduction.

Claims 1-23 and 25-30 are pending. Claims 1-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 22 and 26-30 were rejected. Claims 22, 26-27, and 30 were subjected to a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Claims 22 and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Claims 23 and 25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

II. The Double Patenting Rejection.

Without admitting that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection is proper, the Applicants are submitting a terminal disclaimer herewith to obviate the double patenting rejection.

III. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejection.

Claims 22 and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Publication WO 79/48927 [WO 97/48927], Hawes, et al. in combination with U.S. Patent 3,658,590 issued to Huebner, et al. and U.S. Patent 6,369,019 issued to Gordon, et al.

The Office Action states that Hawes, et al. disclose a process for cleaning a surface comprising contacting the surface with an aqueous composition, then rinsing the surface with purified rinse water by using a hand held sprayer attached to a garden hose. The Office Action acknowledges that Hawes, et al. do not teach the polymer which renders the surface hydrophilic, and rinsing with tap water as claimed. The Office Action states that Heubner, et al. discloses a process for washing a vehicle surface where there is provided a step of providing a tap water rinse between a step of contacting the surface with a cleaning composition and the step of rinsing the surface with purified rinse water. The Office Action further states that Gordon, et al. disclose an aqueous cleaning composition for cleaning surfaces like car exteriors, which composition comprises a polymer and surfactants, and a hydrophilic layer is left on a hard surface cleaned with the composition.

The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the washing process of Hawes, et al. to include the tap water rinse as taught by Heubner, et al. for the purpose of conserving the purified/deionized rinse water, and because Hawes, et al. disclose that the cleaning composition could be removed by water from any source at any time (see page 10, lines 12-13). The Office Action further states that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to substitute a cleaning solution/composition as taught by Gordon, et al. for the cleaning solution of Hawes, et al. since it is deemed to be a substitution of equivalents.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings of the references in the manner suggested in the Office Action.

The Hawes, et al. reference specifies that in a preferred embodiment thereof, the cleaning composition includes a rinse indicator such as an ethoxylated quaternary surfactant which causes the rinse water to bead up when sufficient rinsing has been completed. (See Hawes, et al. page 5, lines 12-15; page 7, lines 3-6) The ethoxylated quaternary surfactant is said to form an invisible film on the glass. This film is said to cause the glass to bead water when the purified rinse water is applied. (See Hawes, et al., page 11, lines 5-9) In order for a surface to cause water to form beads on the same, the surface must be hydrophobic. Therefore, the Hawes, et al. composition renders surfaces hydrophobic.

The cleaning composition taught by Gordon, et al., in contrast, is intended to leave a hydrophilic layer on the hard surface cleaned with the composition. (See Gordon, et al., Col. 7, lines 1-22)

A person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings the Hawes, et al. and and Gordon, et al. references in the manner suggested because the teachings with respect to the compositions thereof are diametrically opposed with respect to the hydrophilicty and hydrophobicity of the surface. One composition renders the surface hydrophobic, and the other renders the surface hydrophilic. Therefore, cleaning solution/composition as taught by Gordon, et al. is not an equivalent of the cleaning solution of Hawes, et al. as suggested in the Office

Action. The Huebner, et al. reference does not resolve the conflicting teaches of the Hawes, et al. and the Gordon, et al. references in this regard.

The combination of references also does not teach disclose the method of Claim 29 wherein each of said cylindrical portions contains ion exchange resin, and one of said cylindrical portions contains an ion exchange resin consisting essentially of strong acid cation ion exchange resin and the other cylindrical portion contains an ion exchange resin consisting essentially of weak base anion ion exchange resin.

IV. Claims 23 and 25.

Claim 23 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 25 is dependent therefrom, and was left in dependent form.

V. Summary.

All of the rejections have been addressed. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested as to Claims 22, 23, and 25-30.

Respectfully submitted,
BRUCE BARGER, ET AL.

By _____
Jeffrey V. Bamber
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 31,148
(513) 627-4597

February 24, 2005
Customer No. 27752
8711RR Amendment 2-2005.doc